REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 1, 2004. Claims 17-24, 41-48, 65-72, and 81-87 are pending in this application, with claims 17, 20, 21, 41, 44, 45, 65, 68, 69, 81, 82, 84, 86, and 87 being in independent form. No claims are amended by the present Request for Reconsideration. It is submitted that no new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised by the present Request for Reconsideration.

Claims 17-24, 41-48, 65-72, and 81-87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hayes, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 6,339,826) in view of Schneider et al. (US Patent No. 6,105,027). Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submit independent claims 17, 20, 21, 41, 44, 45, 65, 68, 69, 81, 82, 84, 86, and 87 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 17 relates to a configuration management system comprising a configuration device configured to perform configuration management functions on objects within the configuration management system, a display device configured to display a representation of the objects in a presentation having a tree display of objects in the configuration management system, and a content display that displays items selected in the tree display, a server machine for executing the configuration device and producing display information for the representation of the objects within the configuration management system, and a network interface connecting the server machine to a network. The network interface is a web interface and the network is one of the Internet and an intranet. The server machine transmits information produced by the configuration device and the display information over the network for display on a remote computer. The transmitted information includes one of an

Active X component, Visual Java program, Java applet, and PERL program configured to utilize the information produced by the configuration device in the presentation.

Hayes, Jr. et al., as understood by Applicant, relates to a computer network in which desktop computer users use personal computers connected to a network, such as a corporate intranet, the Internet, or to any network or internet service provider, to gain access to applications which are then executed on a desktop computer. Server-based storage of software preferences, called configuration data, and access permissions for software are retrieved from a server and executed at the desktop computer.

Schneider relates to a distributed environment such as a computer network (e.g. the internet) where access to data is controlled using a scalable access filter. The filter provides that access is permitted or denied according to access policies.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Hayes, Jr. et al. nor Schneider individually or in combination teach or suggest a configuration management system including a configuration device configured to perform configuration management functions on objects within the configuration management system. For example, the Office Aciton contends that Hayes, Jr. et al. discloses a configuration device configured to perform configuration management functions on objects within the configuration management system. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portion of Hayes, Jr. et al. (col. 7, lines 1-67) relate to "profile management." Profile management of Hayes, Jr. et al. allows an administrator to configure user preferences and user permissions so that users may gain access to applications using a desktop computer. Hayes Jr. et al. as understood by Applicant relates to the management of user profiles. However, Hayes Jr. et al as understood by Applicant does not manage configurations. Accordingly, the profile management of Hayes, Jr. et al. is not a configuration management

system. Additionally, the profile management of Hayes, Jr. et al. is not understood to be configured to perform configuration management functions on objects within the configuration management system. Instead, as understood by Applicant, the profile management of Hayes, Jr. et al. relates to the management of user profiles.

Moreover, as the Examiner admits, Hayes, Jr. et al. fails to explicitly teach a display device configured to display a representation of objects in a presentation having a tree display of objects in a configuration management system, and a content display that displays items selected in tree display.

The Office Action contends that Schneider teaches a display device configured to display a representation of objects in a presentation having a tree display of objects in a configuration management system, and a content display that displays items selected in tree display. However, the portion of Schneider cited (col. 22, lines 36-61) relates to the display of user groups. However Schneider is not understood to teach or suggest the display of objects in a configuration management system as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant submits independent Claim 17 is patentable over the cited art.

Independent claims 20, 21, 41, 44, 45, 65, 68, 69, 81, 82, 84, 86, and 87 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the same reasons as expressed above in relation to claim 17.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required in connection with this Request for Reconsideration and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to

charge the requisite fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Entry of this amendment and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD E JAWORSKI

Reg. No.33,515

Attorney for Applicants Cooper & Dunham LLP

Tel.: (212) 278-0400